



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMERCIAL CENTER, 14th and D Sts., N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20540  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/320,767	05/27/1999	NICK GIANNIOUKAKIS	A32362	5337

21003 7590 03/25/2002

BAKER & BOTTS  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

SORBELLO, ELEANOR

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1632

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2002

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/320,767

Applicant(s)

GIANNOUKAKIS ET AL.

Examiner

Eleanor Sorbello

Art Unit

1632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 20-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 20-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Continued Prosecution Application***

1. The request filed on January 8 2002 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/320,767 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.
2. The Group and/or Art Unit location of your application in the PTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 1632.

***Response to amendment***

3. Applicant's amendment and Response has been received and filed on April 9, 2001 as Paper No. 10B. Claims 1, 5 have been amended. **Claims 1-12, 20-30 are pending.** Applicant's amendments and arguments have been thoroughly reviewed, but are not persuasive for the reasons that follow. Any rejections not reiterated in this action have been withdrawn as being obviated by the amendment of the claims and/or applicant's argument.
4. Applicant's arguments are addressed below on a per section basis. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
5. Claims 1, 5, 9, 20-25 stand rejected, and claims 6, 7 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph (as containing subject matter that was not described) for reasons of record. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants state (see paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3 or Response received April 9, 2001 and filed as Paper No. 10B) that applicants disclose a number of different inhibitors of IL-1 activity and inhibitors of FAS mediated apoptosis. Applicants state that the distinguishing characteristics associated with IL- $\beta$  inhibitors as described in the specification should satisfy the description requirements of the Office, as regards inhibitors of IL-1, and that a more detailed description should not be required. However, examiner maintains that applicants do not describe the nucleotide sequences referred to in the specification (of all inhibitors of IL-1 activity) which includes mutant forms of fas or FADD protein, members of the bcl-2 family (of all inhibitors of FAS mediated apoptosis) etc. etc. (See specification page 18, ¶ 1). Further limitations of applicants claims are directed to methods comprising the administration of nucleic acids encoding a dominant negative mutant of Fas protein, and nucleic acids encoding a dominant negative mutant of FADD protein. Applicants did not describe any nucleic acid encoding any transdominant negative Fas or FADD protein. With the exception of the IL-1 $\beta$  inhibitors such as IL-1Ra, IGF-1 and IRAP wherein the nucleotide sequences are known in the art and are known to be IL-1 $\beta$  inhibitors, the application does not meet the written description provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph.

6. Claims 1-12 and 20-30 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph for reasons of record.

Applicants argue that the claims now amended and directed to a method to treat beta cell dysfunction and Fas mediated beta-cell dysfunction by the administration of a

nucleic acid molecule expressing the inhibitor of IL-beta or inhibitor of Fas mediated apoptosis, which results in the reduction of beta-cell dysfunction, or which results in the reduction of Fas mediated beta-cell dysfunction, are now enabled. (See Response, page 4 ¶ 2, and page 6 ¶ 2). Applicants argue that they have successfully transferred nucleic acid molecules into pancreatic beta cells. (See Response, page 5, ¶ 1, lines 11-13). However, examiner argues that *in vitro* administration of adenoviral vectors comprising the aforesaid nucleic acids to human islet cells, wherein successful expression occurs as evidenced by glucose measurements and NO production, cannot be extrapolated to that which occurs *in vivo*.

Further limitations of applicants base claim 5 recite methods comprising administering nucleic acids encoding transdominant negative mutants of Fas protein and FADD protein. As discussed above in paragraph 5, applicants did not describe such proteins or nucleic acids encoding these transdominant negative mutants. As such, applicants did not describe or support via experimentation any transdominant negative mutant or nucleic acid encoding the aforesaid, applicants are not enabled for such.

Therefore, claims 1-12 and 20-30 stand rejected as applicants did not teach one of skill in the art how to make and use invention as claimed.

7. Claims 20 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for reasons of record.

Applicants contend that the prior art does not teach vectors that have the intended use as that claimed in the instant invention. (See Response, page 7). However, examiner contends that these claims are being examined for features comprising the vector. The functional language of the claims do not lend any additional features to the vector, and

the claims stand rejected as being unpatentable as they are directed to a vector that is rejected as being obvious over Monia in view of Crawford and Robbins.

8. Claims 20 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) for reasons of record. Applicants argue that the claimed vectors are not rendered obvious in view of the cited references because none of the references teach the fact that the expression of an IL-1 beta inhibitor could reduce beta-cell dysfunction. (See Response, page 9, ¶ 2). As discussed above, examiner contends that these claims are being examined for features comprising the vector. The functional language of the claims do not lend any additional features to the vector, and the claims stand rejected as being unpatentable over Crawford in view of Robbins.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Claims 1-12 and 20-30 stand rejected.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Eleanor Sorbello, who can be reached at (703)-308-6043. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 6.30 a.m. to 3.00 p.m. EST.


Questions of formal matters can be directed to the patent analyst, Patsy Zimmerman, whose telephone number is (703) 308-0009.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Reynolds, can be reached on (703) 305-4051. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)

Art Unit: 1632

308-4242. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

If the claims are amended canceled and/or added the applicants are required to follow Amendment Practice under 37 CFR § 1.121 (<http://www.uspto.gov>) and A CLEAN COPY OF ALL PENDING CLAIMS IS REQUESTED to facilitate further examination.

  
DEBORAH J. REYNOLDS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600